



**Braddock Metro Neighborhood Plan Implementation
Advisory Group Meeting #2
Wednesday, March 16, 2011
7:00PM - 9:00PM**

Responses to BIAG Questions that required additional follow -up

James Bland Development Project

Question: Wythe Street is identified as a walking street yet the James Bland development was approved with a sidewalk width along Wythe Street that is less than what was recommended in the BMNP.

Response: The Braddock Plan calls for 14 foot wide sidewalks from the curb to the face of the building. However, the Plan also states that, “a portion of the 14 feet may be landscaped for residential uses if compatible with the character of the street, but maintain a 6- to 8-foot minimum sidewalk width in these areas” (p. 135).

The streetscape enhancements approved with James Bland depict the latter scenario. From the back of the curb to the face of the closest buildings is approximately 14.5 feet. Within that space a 6-foot wide sidewalk, landscaped front yards, and a planting strip are provided.

The rationale behind this type of streetscape on Wythe Street was based on compatibility with the existing neighborhood and creating appropriate transitions from existing sidewalks that are narrow to wider sidewalks on the Charles Houston block with the goal of enhancing the pedestrian environment. The existing concrete sidewalk on the eastern half of the Wythe Street block in question is four feet wide. An abrupt change to a sidewalk almost three times as wide would not be compatible with the neighborhood and would make the new construction look more out of place. The six-foot sidewalk width provides a wider sidewalk and landscaping that more gradually integrates itself with the western half of the block and then with the even wider sidewalks in front of the public building on the next block to the west.

Additionally, the six-foot wide sidewalks allowed for landscaped front yards (part of 14.5 feet noted above.) These yards serve as a building setback that helps transition from the sidewalk to the new buildings at James Bland and helps to make the scale of the new buildings fit in more compatibly with the existing architecture. It was felt that this design would be more consistent with the existing neighborhood than 14-foot wide sidewalks abutting the building face of single family townhouses. Overall, the goal has been to improve the pedestrian environment and experience.

Question: Although this question was not asked at the BIAG meeting, staff would like to proactively address the issue of why street trees are not being provided in the

planting strip along the western half of the Wythe Street block that is described above.

Response: The James Bland site plan originally was going to provide street trees on the western half of the block the new development occupies on Wythe Street. During the final engineering of the plans, utility lines that were installed with the Charles Houston Recreation Center were identified as being in close proximity to the planting strip. These necessary underground utilities were very new and it would have been inappropriate to relocate them. The depth of the lines is approximately two feet deep and this makes it impossible to provide a sufficient depth of excavation for the planting of trees, thus it is necessary to eliminate street trees on that half of the block. In order to mitigate the lack of street trees, the landscape strip between the curb and sidewalk was reduced and the sidewalk was shifted south to create larger green space in front of the units. The green space in front of these units can now accommodate understory trees to maintain the original provision of shade for pedestrians and the new homes. Since this condition effects only half of the block, there should be no significant break in the tree canopy for the street.

Braddock Gateway Project

Comment: The BIAG wants to review any major development projects prior to projects being docketed for Planning Commission or City Council.

Response: The Braddock Gateway project is slated to be on the September Planning Commission docket. Therefore, a presentation on this project will be made to the Braddock IAG during its June meeting.

Existing Braddock Implementation Funds & Retail Enhancement

Question: Can any of the \$100,000 currently in the Braddock Implementation CIP account be used for retail enhancement?

Response: Yes. Funds allocated to Braddock Plan implementation can be used for retail enhancement. Funds may be used for façade improvements and consultant fees directly related to a capital project.

Braddock Metro capacity information

Question: Does the City’s planning process consider impacts to WMATA service and capacity?

Response: Yes. The BMNP considered the impact of proposed development on the Braddock Metro Station. This chart was included in the Plan to demonstrate the moderate ridership at the Braddock Metro Station as compared to other stations and the projected household and job growth at Plan buildout. The Plan also stated that WMATA has capacity to increase service frequency on the Yellow and Blue lines to accommodate anticipated growth and demand (pg. 77).

2007 WMATA COMPARISON OF METRO STATION RIDERSHIP AND DENSITY

STATION	RIDERSHIP	HOUSEHOLDS/ACRE		JOBS/ACRE	
		2005	2030 (PROJECTED)	2005	2030 (PROJECTED)
Braddock Road	8,703	5.9	9.4	12.9	19.6
Clarendon	8,599	10.8	16.9	26.8	37.2
Eastern Market	11,414	11.8	15.6	19.3	26.0
Eisenhower Avenue	3,681	5.1	7.8	14.4	24.2
Friendship Heights	19,237	5.0	6.5	10.5	12.2
King Street	16,228	4.3	7.3	20.8	32.9
Takoma	12,980	6.2	9.2	13.7	14.5
Wheaton	9,518	3.3	4.6	4.1	4.6

Question: What is the capacity of the Braddock Metro station?

Response: In speaking with WMATA, there is plenty of capacity to board or deboard more people at the station. The station was designed to accommodate eight car trains, and most of the current trains are six cars. The amount of usage of this station is relatively low, so there is considerable room to grow.